REMARKS

This is a Supplemental Amendment in reply to the office action issued May 30, 2006, in view of the telephonic interview that the Applicants' representatives, Jay P. Kesan and Clifford Kraft, had with the Examiner on Oct 25, 2006. Applicants had already filed a reply to said office action on Sept. 28, 2006. The Examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harada. The Applicants respectfully disagree for reasons explained hereinafter.

Claims 1 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-28 are currently pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

The Applicants' invention deals with the problem of unusually large information elements before calculating column widths and row heights. Unusually large information elements may be randomly distributed in information arrays. Because of these unusually large elements, the widths or heights calculated for the corresponding columns or rows are also unusually large even when other elements in the column or row are much smaller. This leads to the problem of wastage of display space and causes the information array to overflow beyond the predetermined two dimensional display space. The present invention tackles this problem by determining the ModDSR values of the unsusually large elements and then allocating column widths and row heights using the ModDSR (and not merely DSR) values.

Sub-step (b)(i) in amended claim 1 (and similar claims) selects such unusually large (i.e., comparatively larger) elements and sub-step (b)(ii) in amended claim 1 reduces the DSR values of said elements to calculate ModDSR values. These ModDSR values are then used to allocate column widths and row heights.

Harada does not anticipate the present invention. Harada does teach determining the "optimum cell size" but, clearly, it does not teach the selecting sub-step

(b)(i) and the reducing sub-step (b)(ii) of amended claim 1. These sub-steps of the present invention are different from the broad step of determing "optimum cell size".

Also, the specific cell layout restrictive conditions to determine "optimum cell size" specified by Harada are as follows:

a) the ratio of cell height to width should be approximately equal to 1;

b) cell character width should be slightly greater than or equal to one group of program elements actually arranged in each cell; and

c) the number of cells arranged in a table is as large as possible.

All these three are different from the selecting sub-step (b)(i) and the reducing sub-step (b)(ii) of amended claim 1.

Thus, the broad as well as specific methods disclosed by Harada for determining "optimum cell size" are clearly different from the specific methods of the present invention.

The Examiner relies on Harada (See Abstract; Col. 8, l. 14-65; and Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29) to conclude that step (b) (i.e., moderating the DSR) in claim 1 of the present invention is satisfied. But the portions relied on do not describe or suggest the selecting sub-step (b)(1) or the reducing sub-step (b)(ii) of amended claim 1.

With respect to claim 17 and related claims, the "measuring the lopsidedness" step is not taught by Harada. In line nos. 1-6 on page 7 of the Office Action dated May 30, 2006, the Examiner alleges that "Harada teaches determining the optimum distribution of elements across columns and across rows, i.e., the X and Y axis; and allocating cell widths based on the X or Y axis restrictive condition, i.e. row heights or column widths, respectively" compare to "measuring the lopsidedness of distribution of larger elements across columns and across rows;" and correspondingly allocating column widths or row heights, as taught by the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

11

The Examiner relies on Harada (See Col. 61, l. 32-Col. 62, l. 64) to conclude that step (c) (i.e., measuring the lopsidedness) in claim 17 of the present invention is satisfied. But the portion relied on does not describe or mention lopsidedness, does not describe or mention measuring the lopsidedness and does not mention allocating column widths or rows heights depending on lopsidedness.

With respect to claim 22 and related claims, Harada does not teach the checking step (b). This step checks whether the information array can be displayed in Matrix Format. If the information array cannot be displayed in Matrix Format then the subsequent steps are executed to display the information array in Tall or Wall Format. The Examiner has not cited any prior art which satisfies checking step (b).

Claim 25 reflects the computer system used for implementing the method as claimed in claim 1. Thus claim 25 is also patentable.

Since independent claims 1, 17, 22, & 25 are patentable, so are all the other claims which depend from these.

For these reasons, the Examiner will see that the claims are allowable. The Examiner is respectfully requested to place the case in condition for allowance at her earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Kraft 35,229
FOR JAY P. KESAN

Jay P. Kesan (Reg. No. 37,488)
2709 Windward Blvd.
Champaign, IL 61821
(217)333-7887

12

This paper is being submitted by United States First Class Mail with sufficient postage addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: _Nov. 8, 2006_

Signature: _Clifford Kraft_

Name: **Clifford H. Kraft**